

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JORDAN A. JUST,

No. 3:18-CV-01314

Plaintiff,

(Judge Brann)

v.

(Chief Magistrate Judge Schwab)

JOHN E. WETZEL, *et al.*,

Defendants.

ORDER

DECEMBER 16, 2020

Plaintiff filed the instant action on March 22, 2018, and it was jointly assigned to the undersigned and to Chief Magistrate Judge Susan E. Schwab. Upon designation, a magistrate judge may “conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and . . . submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations.”¹ Once filed, this report and recommendation is disseminated to the parties in the case who then have the opportunity to file written objections.²

On November 24, 2020 Chief Magistrate Judge Schwab, to whom this matter is jointly assigned, issued a thorough report and recommendation recommending that this case be listed for trial at an appropriate time.

No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed. For portions of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made, the

¹ 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(B).

² 28 U.S.C. 636(b)(1).

Court should, as a matter of good practice, “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”³ Regardless of whether timely objections are made by a party, the District Court may accept, not accept, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁴

Because I write solely for the parties, I will not restate the facts, but will instead adopt the recitation of facts as set forth by the magistrate judge. I have conducted a de novo review here and found no error.

AND NOW, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Chief Magistrate Judge Schwab’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. 55) is **ADOPTED in full**.
2. The matter shall be set for trial at an appropriate time. The Court will schedule a telephonic conference with the parties to schedule the matter for trial.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann

Matthew W. Brann
United States District Judge

³ Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Intern., Inc.*, 702 F.Supp.2d 465, 469 (M.D.Pa.2010) (*citing Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir.1987) (explaining that judges should give some review to every report and recommendation)).

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.